

REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLIED OCCUPATION OF JAPAN

[Metadata, citation and similar papers at core](#)

RE
by LSE Research Online

Sebastian Swann:

‘Democratization and the Evasion of War Responsibility:
the Allied Occupations of Japan and the Emperor’

Discussion Paper
No.IS/99/370
October 1999

The Suntory Centre
Suntory and Toyota International Centres
for Economics and Related Disciplines
London School of Economics and Political
Science
Houghton Street
London, WC2A 2AE
Tel.: 0171-405 7686

Preface

During a visit from Washington, Dr Sebastian Swann addressed an International/Japanese Studies symposium on 28 April 1999 under the title *Reflections on the Allied Occupation of Japan*. Dr Swann who has recently been involved in translating the work of Professor Eiji Takemae, a leading Japanese expert on studies of the allied occupation of Japan, offered a paper on 'Democratization and the Evasion of War Responsibility.

We are grateful to the author for allowing us to reproduce his paper here.

Keywords: Allied Occupation of Japan.

© Sebastian Swann. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Democratization and the Evasion of War Responsibility: the Allied Occupation of Japan and the Emperorⁱ

by

Sebastian Swann

The American-led Occupation of Japan was a remarkable historical event. The first time in its history that the country had been successfully invaded, Japan was 'revolutionized from above' by an unprecedented program of demilitarization and democratization designed to transform the country into a peace-loving nation run by a government 'in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the Japanese people'.ⁱⁱ A rigidly hierarchical state officially dedicated to the execution of the Imperial Will was given a constitution that placed sovereignty in the hands of the people and forbade the presence of military forces on Japanese soil. In addition, most of the legal constraints upon the holding and expression of opinions that had resulted in the imprisonment, hard labour and deaths of tens of thousands of those deemed insufficiently enthusiastic in their support of the 'national polity' were struck down. Once-imprisoned communists started to contribute to a legalized political discourse that included the castigation of the Emperor and his ministers for eating too much while the rest of the population starved.ⁱⁱⁱ With even the crime of *lese-majeste* seemingly about to become an anachronism, Japan was entering a new historical era with the legitimacy of its traditional power structure appearing in the midst of unprecedented attack.

The contradictions implied in the idea that a country can be liberalized and democratized 'from above' has encouraged conservative academics

and right-wing politicians in Japan to argue that the Occupation was a foreign imposition and even a violation of international law.^{iv} But (as occupation scholars such as Takemae Eiji and many others argue) the successful efforts of Japanese people in rejecting the efforts of their conservative leaders to amend the constitution and eliminate its 'no-war' provision is an extremely important indication of the enduring legacy of the early Occupation reforms.^v This did not mean that all GHQ's reforms were lasting; nor did it mean that the United States continued to support many of its earlier initiatives. Despite the existence of the Constitution and Article Nine, Cold War priorities and intense pressure from Washington both before and after the Occupation ended in 1952 has ensured that Japan's Self Defence Force – while not officially an army – is nevertheless one of the most well-funded and potentially one of the biggest military establishments in the world. But these important caveats aside, it remains difficult to deny that the early Occupation reforms provided a crucial impetus and breathing-space for the generation of a genuine popular democracy 'from below'; or that – however dictatorial, patrician or even racial in attitude – GHQ/SCAP's democratization directives were a catalyst enabling the Japanese subsequently to ensure that the country's break with its authoritarian past would remain permanent. In retrospect, there seems little doubt that what one historian described as 'Japan's American interlude'^{vi} played an essential part in the country's transition to a vibrant postwar democracy.

The Occupation, however, entailed more than people benefiting from the liberalization of Japan's political system. The process of returning Japan to a peacetime footing entailed enormous human costs; simply repatriating millions of soldiers and their families resulted in widespread distress, bereavement, orphans and homelessness. In addition, there

was more than one occupation of Japan. In stark contrast to Japan's main islands, Okinawans and residents of Japanese-inhabited northern islands off the tip of Hokkaido did not enjoy the fruits of the Japanese postwar constitution or the relatively benign process of an indirect Occupation, but were instead subjected to the harsh regimen of direct US and Soviet military rule. Okinawa had already lost one out of three of its entire civilian population in less than three months in the some of the Second World War's most savage fighting during the summer of 1945. The island's subsequent occupation did not end until 1972, twenty years after the Occupation of Japan proper had been wound up, and then only after more than 20 percent of the island's land had been forcibly appropriated to function indefinitely as bases for U.S. armed forces. The northern territories and their Japanese inhabitants remain under Russian military rule today.^{vii}

Other groups also failed to benefit from the Occupation. These include the country's 2-3 million burakumin, the dwindling Ainu people, and non-Japanese Asians residing in Japan such as Koreans and Chinese, many of whom were brought over in the heyday of the Empire and forcibly relocated to Japan to work in the mines and perform other arduous and dangerous tasks for the prosecution of the 'holy war'.^{viii} For the Chinese and in particular the Korean minority in Japan, a group that amounted at war's end to some two-and-a-half million people, the plethora of GHQ civil liberties directives, electoral reforms and other liberalization initiatives were a complete failure in preventing a Japanese government-directed onslaught upon their political and economic rights, their efforts to preserve their national identity and even their ability to assimilate into Japanese society.^{ix}

These were not the only war victims that continued to lose out during and long after the Occupation had ended. Atomic bomb survivors (*hibakusha*) have faced all sorts of problems, medical, financial and social, with tens of thousands of Koreans unable for many years to be officially recognized or remembered as part of this group, and even then not in the same commemorative area as their Japanese fellow-sufferers.^x Other war victims whose existence continues to be denied in certain quarters are the women (perhaps as many as 80% Korean) who were dragooned to serve as sex-slaves for the Japanese army (*jugun-ianfu*).^{xi} Numbering anywhere between 50,000 and 200,000 people, this group's treatment was not taken up by Allied postwar war crimes' tribunals, although Japan's wartime enslavement of white women in the Netherlands' East Indies was deemed sufficiently serious to be treated by local Dutch courts as a crime of war.^{xii} The mistreatment by Japanese soldiers of non-Asian and Asian POWs is more well known, as is the Japanese government's reluctance to admit an ongoing moral or financial responsibility for their suffering.^{xiii} But the plight of numerous Asians in Japan – who were sometimes forced virtually at gunpoint to participate in Japan's war effort and then fingered by their ex-colonial overlords as being responsible for the crimes which they themselves committed or ordered – has only recently started to become generally recognized.^{xiv}

The contrast in treatment of these groups and many of those responsible for their plight has also been particularly acute. Although the Allies have, with reason, been criticized for imposing a 'victor's justice' upon Japan, the pace at which suspected, indicted and convicted Japanese war criminals were allowed – even by occupation authorities – to rejoin mainstream society has been the target of considerably less criticism,

especially among Japanese nationalist circles. First released during the Occupation and sometimes surreptitiously recruited as members of GHQ's intelligence agencies, these elements (which included members of bacteriological warfare units in China who were suspected of performing BW experiments with plague germs on human 'guinea pigs') were, within a short period of time after the Occupation had ended, allowed to become Prime Ministers, Ministers of State, members of the Diet, bureaucrats, men of industry and finance and members of the armed forces. As fully funded state pensioners and war veterans, their war contributions, however dubious, received increasingly overt marks of official approval, as high government officials from the Emperor on down began to pay their respects – in violation of the constitutionally mandated principle of separation of religion and state – at the Shinto shrine for Japan's war dead at Yasukuni.^{xv} Yet while the rehabilitation of these elements proceeded apace, other Asians who had also participated in the war effort on Japan's behalf were stripped of their Japanese nationality, prevented from receiving state assistance, pensions, or veterans' benefits and – as was the case with Korean miners who were forcibly relocated to the island of Sakhalin during the war and then abandoned after the Russians took over – denied relocation expenses back to their country of birth, residence or ethnic origin by the country responsible for their plight, which for a long time refused even to acknowledge their existence.^{xvi}

It has not really been until after the death of Emperor Hirohito in 1989 that these and other stigmatized groups have finally – mainly through the Japanese court system – been able to 'address the unfinished business of World War Two' by calling Japan's government to account. Many of the issues before the courts have concerned problems of financial

compensation, in the form of unpaid state pensions, repatriation expenses, veterans' benefits or other social security benefits.^{xvii} But the underlying issues surrounding Japan's disparate treatment of war survivors and war dead have not simply or primarily concerned money. And, because of this, it is sometimes difficult looking at this problem from the outside to understand the intensity of feelings generated by what at times seem to be mere formulations of words. Why is it really necessary for the government to 'apologize' for the war? What is the real difference between an official and an unofficial apology? Why is it not acceptable to say that Japan 'advanced into' rather than 'invaded' Asia? Why is the issue of POW and veterans' compensation so controversial, given the declining number of Allied and Japanese veterans who are still alive to claim it? Why does the Japanese government refuse to bite the bullet and settle such claims once and for all?

Particularly in view of the negative international fallout accruing to Japan as a result of the government's refusal to take decisive action on these matters, why such issues have for so long remained unresolved requires explanation. There has certainly been no overwhelming administrative or financial imperative that has rendered them inherently insoluble, yet the government has failed to do anything that the plaintiffs or world opinion could regard as even a sincere indication of positive intent. But while at first sight seemingly rather trivial, these problems are the outward manifestations of an organized governmental attempt to evade war responsibility that originated in the early months of the Occupation, when GHQ decided to retain and protect from trial a monarch who, as recently released materials suggest, was much less of a figurehead in the prosecution of Japan's war effort than has been widely assumed.^{xviii} The preservation of Hirohito and his many years of subsequent rule as the

Emperor Showa are one of the main reasons why so many people who were forced to make such sacrifices in his name have had to wait for so long before being able to settle their accounts. It is largely in recognition of them that I wish to revisit the issue of the Emperor's war responsibility – in particular, why investigation of the subject was evaded and the repercussions this has had for Japan's postwar democratization process.

Japan's Emperors have not always been able to claim the power and authority that had accrued to the ruler by 1945. For many centuries a minor and virtually unknown political figure, sometimes actually imprisoned by Japan's feudal overlords, the Emperor and his position within the ruling hierarchy underwent a dramatic change with the accession of the Emperor Meiji in 1868, the year of Japan's so-called opening to the West and the fall of its feudal shogunate. Commonly called an imperial 'restoration', the Emperor was in fact elevated to a new position of absolute authority, with the rest of the government organized ostensibly to do no more than advise the all-powerful monarch and be an accurate transmitter of the Imperial Will. According to the Meiji Constitution of 1889, the Emperor was declared 'sacred and inviolable',^{xix} which meant, according to the Meiji patriarch, Ito Hirobumi, that he was 'heaven-descended', 'divine' and 'preeminent above his subjects'.^{xx} He was not simply God's representative or the executor of a mandate of heaven that could at least in theory be withdrawn, but was actually a 'living god'. In the words of the 1937 *Kokutai no Hongi* (Cardinal Principles of the National Polity), the Emperor was a 'deity incarnate' directly descended from the Sun Goddess, who was in turn supposedly the founder of Japan and the grandmother of the first Japanese emperor some twenty or thirty centuries earlier.^{xxi}

Essential to the course of the entire Occupation reform program was the question of how the Emperor was to be treated. This was no ordinary political figure and certainly very different from the generally declining breed of European hereditary monarchs. To quote Ito Hirobumi, the Emperor merely had 'to pay due respect to the law', but 'the law' had 'no power to hold Him accountable to it. Not only shall there be no irreverence for the Emperor's person, but also shall He neither be made a topic of derogatory comment nor one of discussion'.^{xxii} In practical terms, this meant that he could issue edicts that could override or nullify Parliamentary actions at any time. It also meant that he was Commander-in-Chief of Japan's armed forces, with the power to issue declarations of war and surrender decrees. A wealthy landowner aided by his relatives (who were in leadership positions in the Army and Navy General Staffs during the war years), as well as elder statesmen, privy councilors and an imperial household of enormous political influence, the Emperor was at the apex of a traditional, popularly unaccountable and secretive elite which had placed no real institutional restraints upon his ability to wage war, make peace or micromanage the country's activities in peace or war.^{xxiii} Therefore, central to the treatment of the Emperor was the question of whether he would be made accountable for his wartime actions. For many Japanese at least, it was upon whether the Showa Emperor would be induced to accept moral responsibility by declaring that his 'holy war' was unequivocally 'wrong' that the commitment of Japan's other leaders really to 'turn over a new leaf' and accept the democratic process would ultimately depend.^{xxiv}

GHQ took three major actions in this regard. The first was to get the Emperor to issue the so-called 'declaration of humanity' edict of 1 January, 1946. In this statement, the historically questionable notion that

‘the ties between me (the Emperors) and my people have always been formed by mutual trust and affection’ -- which was arguably not much more than a toned-down reworking of the old imperialistic idea of ‘a hundred million hearts beating as one’ – was qualified by the important caveat that such sentiments no longer ‘depend on mere legends and myths’ or ‘the false conception that the Emperor is divine’. This decline from divine status, Hirohito nevertheless subsequently insisted, meant only that he was not a living god or a god in the Western sense; it was not a renunciation of his supposed direct lineage to the Sun Goddess or of the sacerdotal functions that his august genes supposedly bestowed upon him.^{xxv} Even this, however, was too much for some Japanese politicians. Shigemitsu Mamoru (a major proponent of the idea that Japan should accept Allied surrender terms and a representative of Japan at the surrender ceremony on *USS Missouri*) exclaimed years later that ‘there is nothing wrong in the Japanese people worshipping the emperor as a living *kami*’.^{xxvi} Meanwhile, the Prime Minister at the time of the emperor’s declaration, the renowned ‘anti-militarist’, ‘pro-western’ ‘moderate’ and ‘internationalist’ Shidehara Kijuro, continued to refer reverentially to his sovereign’s ‘sacred character’ at the very time he was meant to be involved in drafting a statement in which the Emperor’s divinity would supposedly be denied.^{xxvii}

The second action SCAP took was to redefine the Emperor’s political powers. In the 1947 constitution, which replaced the 1889 Meiji Charter, the monarch was now described as ‘the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power’.^{xxviii} Keeping the Emperor as a ‘symbol of state’ and ‘unity of the people’ was not in itself a particularly democratic idea. The notion of him continuing to represent the ‘unity of

the people' could be interpreted as a reaffirmation of Japan's supposed racial purity and cultural homogeneity, two ideas that were central to the old 'family nation' construct in which the right of Koreans, Taiwanese, Chinese and 'aliens' of whatever ethnic background to coexist on an equal footing with Japanese in Japan was implicitly denied. Nevertheless, to say that the once-'inviolable' ruler, the expression of whose 'will' had previously been the objective of the entire political system, now derived his position from the 'will of the people' was an important affirmation of the notion of popular sovereignty that appeared to mark a major – if by no means unqualified – break with the past.

While these actions were with some justification hailed as progressive acts of democratization, the third action taken by GHQ -- the decision to retain the Emperor system as well as the monarch who had presided over the worst years of Japanese imperial rule – was much more controversial. Japan had surrendered without the Allies giving a formal undertaking to preserve any of its existing government, including the imperial house. The two US policy statements outlining the parameters of MacArthur's mission – the SWNCC/150 Japanese Initial Post-Surrender document of August 1945 and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Basic Directive No. 1385 of November, specifically instructed the Supreme Commander that, in establishing indirect Occupation rule, the 'use' of existing Japanese ruling institutions to execute Occupation directives did not mean they should either be permanently 'supported' or 'preserved.'^{xxix} Yet despite this, MacArthur – on his own initiative – decided not simply to retain the Emperor, but to shield him from any war crimes investigations. This was in blatant disregard of the adamant objections of many of the International Military War Crimes' Tribunal's judges (including its chief justice) and intense anti-Emperor sentiments

of Allied popular opinion, where polls time and again in the United States, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere indicated that the Emperor either was a war criminal or that he should at least be tried to determine that fact.^{xxx} Instead, a view of Japan's pre-surrender past was assiduously promoted by GHQ, according to which the Emperor was no more than the 'captive' of a prewar military clique led by Tojo Hideki (a military general and Prime Minister for most of the Pacific War) which had somehow 'taken over' the political system in the 1930's to promote its own aggressive designs.^{xxxi}

Why was the Supreme Commander so intent upon going the extra mile to preserve the Japanese ruler? According to the official line later promoted by GHQ, MacArthur had not made up his mind about the Emperor until, in a private meeting with the Monarch on 28 September 1945, he was 'moved' to the 'marrow of his being' (or words to such effect) by Hirohito's humility and sincerity in wanting to take personal responsibility for the war.^{xxxii} However, reference to an imperial desire to make war amends was absent from the account of that meeting issued many years later by the Emperor's interpreter, the only other person in on the conversation.^{xxxiii} In addition, there is little in any other recorded comments of the Showa Emperor to suggest that he ever voluntarily desired to make such a gesture, or indeed ever registered genuine remorse for the war or his role in promoting it.

The other justification MacArthur issued for his action was in a telegram to US Army Chief of Staff Eisenhower in January 1946, a time when popular pressure outside Japan for the Hirohito's indictment as a war criminal had become particularly intense. In this communication, MacArthur said that the Emperor was a 'symbol' 'uniting all Japanese'

who, as captive to the militarists during the entire course of the previous decade, was simply forced to doing their bidding. On this basis, he melodramatically warned that Hirohito's removal and indictment as a war crimes suspect would induce 'tremendous' national 'convulsion', 'disintegration', a 'vendetta for revenge... whose cycle may not be complete for centuries, if ever', with prospects of a complete government breakdown, the cessation of 'civilized practices' and 'some form of intense regimentation probably along communistic lines' 'aris(ing) from the masses', creating a situation that would require 'a minimum of a million troops... for an indefinite number of years'.^{xxxiv}

It is easy to imagine how such grandiloquence might have stunned MacArthur's superiors in Washington into appalled silence and then awed compliance. But how much of this was actually true is another question. Japan's presumed reliance upon the Emperor system had never been tested by facts, figures, numbers or any other type of serious empirical investigation. GHQ had never conducted, as MacArthur misleadingly informed Eisenhower, a systematic investigation into the Emperor's pre-surrender political role. The notion that Hirohito was a mere puppet during this period had been developed largely by MacArthur's advisors and accepted by him prior to Japan's surrender. This was long before anyone in GHQ could have had access to the political or military records within Japan that might have indicated otherwise. That Japan's surrender might actually have been the result of a decision taken by the Emperor and imposed by him upon a hopelessly divided government was simply ignored. Furthermore, even if the Supreme Commander was correct in all his dire pronouncements, no reason had yet been advanced as to why the present occupant of the Imperial Throne should not take personal responsibility for the war by

abdicating and being replaced by someone else,^{xxxv} an option that – as the Emperor himself was aware – had respectable historical precedents.^{xxxvi}

MacArthur was perhaps on his firmest ground in warning against the abolition of the Emperor system entirely. Even here, however, what information we now have indicates that the terrain was extremely slushy. In answering pollsters' question about whether the Emperor and imperial institution should remain, most Japanese in post-Occupation surveys have responded in the affirmative.^{xxxvii} But whether that represented a deep attachment to the monarch and what he stood for is questionable. In a survey conducted by the US Strategic Bombing Survey in early 1946 as to the feelings of ordinary Japanese when they heard Japan had surrendered, only 4% registered a sense of 'worry', 'shame' or 'sorrow' for the Emperor.^{xxxviii} This tended to be confirmed by the regional reports of military police and the Home Ministry's Special Thought Police during the autumn of 1945. In them, there are references to 'words and deeds against the Emperor' 'tending to increase' as part of 'the general public's distrust and antipathy' 'towards those who govern' (Shiga Prefecture); to children singing somewhat irreverent songs; and to homeless people invading shrines and temples and hanging their diapers in sacred areas previously dedicated at least in part to the preservation of the imperial sacerdotal mystique.^{xxxix}

There was little evidence in any of all this indicating that the demise of the imperial institution would have caused a great deal of public anxiety.^{xl} Much of the imperial kudos had evaporated when the Emperor made his 15 August pronouncement bringing his 'holy war' to an end.^{xli} Most people were subsequently much more concerned with the

mundane but crucial problems of finding food, clothing, shelter, family and simply managing to survive. According to a December 1945 report of a unit of GHQ's Civil Intelligence Section that was operating in Tokyo, 'with regard to the Emperor system.... the Allies are unduly apprehensive of the effect on the Japanese if the Emperor was removed... at the most there might be demonstrations... particularly in the rural districts... but these would soon pass'. The unit went on to say that 'many people have reached a state where it is almost immaterial to them whether the Emperor is retained or not'; that 'the younger generation are not regarding him with the same degree of dignity as formerly'; and that 'he has even become the "point" of many jokes in the past three months'.^{xlii} This was in almost shocking contrast to the notion piously advanced by Joseph Grew, US Ambassador to Japan between 1931 and 1941, that the relationship of the Emperor to his people could be equated to that of the Queen Bee and the hive: remove the Queen and the hive disintegrates.^{xliii}

Not only (as is suggested above) was there little to suggest that the hive (Japanese people) was continuing to operate around the Queen Bee principle; there was even less to suggest a particular attachment to the present Queen Bee herself (Hirohito). Amongst the frenzied speculation circulating the country about the future of the Emperor in the autumn of 1945 included rumours that his ancestors were not even Japanese, a development that prompted residents in Shimonoseki, according to the Civil Intelligence Section, to express their 'preference for a Japanese president rather than an Emperor of Indian ancestry'.^{xliv} To add to the uncertainty, a Nagano man claimed superior lineage to the gods than Hirohito by virtue of his descent from the southern rather than northern courts of the fourteenth century imperial family.^{xlv} At about the same

time, a housewife in Yamaguchi prefecture founded a new religion (Amaterasu Kotai Jingukyo) (Religion of the Great Shrine of Amaterasu) by claiming that she had recently been impregnated by something that was sufficiently special to give her a direct line to the Sun Goddess. Unsurprisingly, both these characters – who were only part of a larger line of colourful pretenders that sprang up at this time – had little time for the present emperor, who was openly castigated as a ‘war criminal’. Such criticism generated instant press copy, celebrity status and – in the case of the Amaterasu Kotai religion – a popular following of over 300,000 within a few years. In this way, a phenomenon that was later described as a ‘rush hour of the gods’ played its part in breaking down the notion of ‘ten thousand generations in a single line’: i.e. that the present imperial family could claim direct, unbroken descent to the deity from the beginning of time.^{xlvi}

While at a popular level the layers of religious mystique surrounding the emperor were being removed, the prospect of Hirohito’s abdication (although not uniformly supported) was being taken seriously by Japan’s intelligentsia and political elite, if only as a way of preserving the integrity of the imperial institution. GHQ was in the process of trying to avoid this possibility by attributing all responsibility for Japan’s imperial past to a cabal of ‘militarists’ to be tried as Class A war crimes’ suspects. But few people seemed to believe that such a strategy would really exonerate the Emperor. A military report quoted in the diary of imperial vice chamberlain, Kinoshita Michio, reflected the general Japanese belief that ‘as the ruler, he (the Emperor) bears responsibility for the nation’s war unless he is a robot’.^{xlvii} On this basis, scions of the Japanese establishment including Prince Higashikuni, the Emperor’s uncle and first postwar prime minister,^{xlviii} Prince Konoe, one of the most powerful

Japanese politicians since the mid 1930s, Prince Mikasa, the Emperor's younger brother, Kido Koichi, a lord keeper of the privy seal and one-time Home Minister, and Mibuchi Tadahiko, chief justice of Japan's Supreme Court, believed Hirohito bore legal and moral responsibility for the war, urging him at various times (including the autumn of 1945) to stand down as a way of saving the throne and perhaps the indignity of a war crimes trial.^{xlix}

All this was in stark contrast to the efforts subsequently made particularly in the West to show how the supposedly 'peace loving' Emperor could only have played a minimal role in the day-to-day decision-making during the period Japan was on the rampage.ⁱ But had this really been true, how or why such a supposedly 'hands-off', or 'captive', monarch could have made the personal initiative Hirohito took in agreeing finally to surrender is hard to explain. Furthermore, having succeeded in August 1945 in finally stopping the war, the question remained as to whether the monarch could have made more of an effort to stop it earlier. He certainly had the opportunity at least to try when Prince Konoe presented a memorial to the Throne in early 1945 petitioning the Emperor immediately to end the war – an act that would have prevented the subsequent fire bombings of Tokyo, the carnage in Okinawa and the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.ⁱⁱ As far as Konoe and others were concerned, the Emperor's strategy of 'adopting the English style of constitutional practice' of 'avoiding to take the initiative as much as possible' when – unlike England – 'His Majesty is able (through the constitution) to control both the government and the High Command', amounted to a willful 'passivity' in the conduct of state affairs. This, it could be argued, just as surely hastened the final destruction reigned down upon Japan at the end of World War Two as it

encouraged the Kwantung Army to make provocative strikes into Manchuria and the rest of China in the 1930's.^{lii}

Japanese first-hand sources – ranging from the Kido Diary and Saionji-Harada memoirs to Hirohito's own written recollections of his role in the wartime period that was prepared with his senior advisors in early-1946 (the Monologue)^{liii} – reveal that the Emperor (particularly from 1937 onwards when the need to mediate friction between the increasingly powerful army and navy factions became more intense) often played a more 'hands-on' role than was suggested in Konoe's depiction.^{liv} But the important point is that, as a ruler with constitutional powers to hire or fire cabinets and cabinet members at will, Hirohito could not – even in the minds of many of his closest relatives, advisors and political colleagues – avoid moral responsibility for the catastrophic consequences of either his action or inaction; both were largely a matter of choice. At the very least, even if, as poet Miyoshi Tatsuji posited in a spring 1946 magazine article, 'he really could not control the army and navy under his command and had given up trying to do so', continuing to tell his subjects that they were 'the Emperor's soldiers' going into battle to fulfil the imperial 'will' amounted to a 'negligence in the performance of his duties' and betrayal of his people that 'made his responsibility all the greater.'^{lv} As ex-Privy Seal and Home Minister Kido Koichi argued in late-1951, when languishing in Sugamo prison as a convicted Grade A war criminal, 'no matter how one looks at it, the Emperor bears responsibility for losing this war (kondo no haisen ni tsuite wa nan toshitemo heika ni go sekinin aru)'. He went on to say in a note delivered to the Emperor via his son that he should 'abdicate for the sake of your imperial ancestors and for the nation', warning him that a failure to do so would bring about an 'end result that only the Imperial family will not

have taken responsibility and an unclear mood will remain which, I fear, might leave an eternal scar'.^{lvi}

While often advanced (particularly in the case of Kido and Konoe) for political reasons in order to minimize their own responsibility for Japanese wartime excesses, these were serious arguments. Furthermore, the premise upon which they were based -- that absolute power entailed unavoidable responsibility -- was generally upheld as late as 1944 even by those within GHQ who were later to argue against the Emperor's indictment. In a psychological study of the Japanese prepared for his chief, MacArthur aide General Bonner Fellers admitted that 'as Emperor and acknowledged head of state, Hirohito cannot escape war guilt. He must be considered an instigator of the Pacific War'.^{lvii} In October 1945, Joseph Grew, the chief American defender of the Japanese imperial house and supporter of the notion of the peace-loving monarch, concluded ruefully that the Emperor could not avoid responsibility for having signed the declaration of war and that consequently 'Hirohito will have to go'.^{lviii}

Yet, by the beginning of 1946, the newly-arrived chief prosecutor for the war crimes trials, Joseph Keenan, was telling his staff (the International Prosecution Section) that the Emperor was absolutely not to be a target of investigation and that anyone who could not agree to this should 'by all means go home immediately'.^{lix} Meanwhile, GHQ officials told the Palace to stop any 'funny talk' about the possibility of abdication,^{lx} while arrested war crimes suspects who, under interrogation, were prepared to talk about imperial responsibility, were accused of evading their own. In this way, Konoe Fumimaro -- one politician particularly well qualified to talk about the subject -- was derided by his American interrogator as a

‘rat... quite prepared to sell anyone to save himself’ by going ‘so far as to call his master, the Emperor, “the major war criminal”’.^{lxi} As Fellers was reported to have said (to Yonai Mitsumasa) in early March, ‘it would be most convenient if the Japanese side could prove to us that the Emperor is completely blameless’ by having people such as these and ‘Tojo, in particular, being made to bear all responsibility at his trial’ instead.^{lxii}

Why MacArthur was prepared to go to the length of subverting the course of the International War Crimes Tribunal to prevent the Emperor from being prosecuted requires some explanation. The answer certainly does not lie in the policy directives from Washington advocating indirect rule; as late as January 1946, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) specifically mentioned that they had no expectations that the Emperor would be shielded from war crimes trial proceedings.^{lxiii} But one of the assumptions shared by MacArthur and his aides was that ‘the people of Japan, who believe themselves to be gods, are unaware of and absolutely cannot understand either democracy or American political idealism’.^{lxiv} Assuming that the Japanese, who in war propaganda had been described as monkeys and subsequently referred to by MacArthur as ‘children’, were congenitally incapable of reaching the exalted state of their occupiers, the best thing to do was to rely on what was perceived to be, in the words of an aide, ‘their blind obedience to the Emperor’^{lxv} by utilizing the monarch to achieve Occupation goals. The Emperor’s surrender announcement had been extremely successful in getting Japanese soldiers to lay down their arms and accept a foreign occupation without violence or bloodshed.^{lxvi} It was therefore tempting for the imperious MacArthur to insert GHQ into the space that the old

discredited military cliques had vacated, using (as had the feudal shoguns before him) the newly subordinated Emperor and his autocratic powers to legitimate and execute his commands. This meant that nothing could be allowed to undermine what was described as 'the mystic hold the Emperor has on his people'^{lxvii} – whether it be war crimes trials, popular demonstrations against the Emperor, republican forms of thought or any type of mass action that sought radically to undermine existing lines of authority.

Under this scenario, prospects for genuine democratic reform seemed limited. Nor did such an objective figure prominently in the minds of some of the most influential US policymakers towards Japan. In May 1945, Joseph Grew expressed his considered opinion to President Truman that, 'from the long range point of view the best we can hope for in Japan is the development of a constitutional monarchy, experience having shown that democracy in Japan would never work'.^{lxviii} According to this viewpoint, the job of the Occupation would be to do not much more than eliminate the more uncooperative (i.e. pro-German) militarists and their supporters from the Japanese elite, while relying on those members of the oligarchy who had been 'less outspokenly and obviously anxious to precipitate war with the United States and Britain'.^{lxix} But these people (who included court officials, zaibatsu chiefs and certain trusted navy officers) were the so-called 'moderates' upon whom prewar US and British diplomats had so unsuccessfully relied in the 1930s. As one of Grew's critics pointed out in 1944, 'British and US Tories declare that the Emperor must be kept in a beaten Japan as a safeguard against Communism. The problem in Japan is not and has never been Communism. It is feudalism... The dangers... that for 70 years have led Japan along the war path... do not spring from the masses; they come

from the ruling class'.^{lxx} The problem with the so-called 'moderates' or 'liberals', according to this view, was – to quote New Dealer and Asian expert, Thomas Bisson – that 'they are much more closely allied to the militarists, whom we are asked to concentrate on eliminating, than to the people as a whole'.^{lxxi}

Had Hirohito taken Konoe's advice and surrendered at the beginning of 1945, it is likely that the Occupation's democratization program would never have gone beyond the Grew prescription. But Grew and his Japan Crowd assistants at the State Department were replaced during the summer by a coalition of China specialists under Dean Acheson who were influenced to a greater extent by New Dealers and progressives of various stripes. Also no doubt appalled by the bloodbaths of the last few months of the Pacific War, these people wanted to implement a broader based policy that sought to eradicate not simply a few war-like people in Japan but the country's 'will to war' itself. As a result, a broad range of political and social reform directives were sent to the Japanese government during the first six months of the Occupation that included fairly far-reaching purges of those considered linked to Japanese imperial expansion, the abolition of all constraints on free speech, the liberation of political prisoners, the abolition of the Thought Police, education reform, the eradication of militaristic school textbooks, the disestablishment of the Shinto religion, electoral reform (widening the franchise to women) and the elimination of restraints upon the formation of labour unions. In order to dismantle the economic organization of Japan's war machine, preliminary efforts were also made to undermine the monopolistic power of the relatively small number of big financial conglomerates (*zaibatsu* dissolution) and initiate a program of war reparations.^{lxxii}

Although often carried out with zeal and skill, these measures were implemented by a privileged neo-colonial elite that had little expectation that the Japanese – the defeated and emaciated enemy with the supposedly strong ‘herd instincts’ – would respond with anything more than ‘obsequious’ gratitude for their improved lot. But the myriad problems of bad harvests, food shortages, unemployment, hyperinflation, a rampant black market, a massive robbery of state assets by Japanese government officials and their big-business and military cronies and the complete failure of the Occupation and its wage and price controls to stem any of this galvanized the Japanese to take matters into their own hands. By the end of 1946, what a State Department official had described as ‘inert and tradition-bound’ Japanese^{lxxiii} had taken advantage of the liberalized trade union laws to generate a radical union movement that had unionized almost six million workers and engaged in widespread, and at times extremely imaginative, industrial action. Meanwhile, millions of people participated in ‘food mayday’ demonstrations across the country in April and May, culminating in a demonstration on 19 May 1946 in front of the Imperial Palace of 250,000, waving placards with the words ‘let us eat enough to be able to work’, requesting entrance to the well-stocked Palace kitchens, but also respectfully addressing the Emperor (in many cases) to solve the situation in the traditional way of getting rid of his corrupt advisors and replacing them with those more in touch with popular needs.^{lxxiv}

While impressive, the upsurge of labour activism was never intended to undermine the Occupation or its goals. Nor was it particularly disruptive. While numerous strikes occurred (largely the result of rampant inflation

wiping out every gain won by workers), most of them were short lived, often less than 24 hours. Only once, according to GHQ/SCAP figures, did total man days lost to labour disputes exceed 1% of total labour output between 1945 and 1948.^{lxxv} Indeed, production was often maintained or increased during industrial action, as was the case with the 'production control' movement, when workers often acting on their own initiative simply took over the shop floor, locked out management, raised production (while revealing the incompetence or machinations of their managers who were sometimes suspected of sabotaging production by deliberate mismanagement in the hope of inducing an Occupation clampdown) and then relinquished management functions once their demands were met. All this, however, was met with a warning by MacArthur on 20 May 1946 that 'the growing tendency towards mass violence and physical processes of intimidation, under organized leadership, present a grave menace to the future development of Japan'.^{lxxvi} This was a devastating blow to unions, the labour movement and those who were looking to extend democracy by peaceful action from below. When this was followed by his last-minute prohibition of a General Strike planned for 1 February the following year, the future of the Occupation's entire democratization program was put into question.

It was largely in response to these developments that GHQ first prepared itself for a dramatic scaling back of initial Occupation goals. As a result, the Left wept 'tears of limitless anger' towards the Occupation authorities for, in the words of General Strike organizer Ii Yasujiro, 'deceiving the Japanese people with democracy only at the tip of their tongues', while conservative Old Guard politicians such as Yoshida Shigeru became ecstatic as they saw a chance for a political comeback.^{lxxvii} Meanwhile, at the Imperial Palace, the talk about Hirohito

having to abdicate to take responsibility for the war and save the imperial institution that had coloured the first few months of the Occupation receded markedly. Shrewdly assessing the changing tenor of the times, Imperial Vice Chamberlain Kinoshita Michio stated in his diary sometime in early 1946, in order to quash abdication talk once and for all, that 'it is of vital importance... to implant the impression that the present emperor is the most desirable and trustworthy person for the United States in the control of Japan and also in international relations, particularly in the Orient'.^{lxxviii}

The Emperor proved to be a quick student. Only four days after the Food Mayday demonstration of 19 May, Hirohito used his authority on MacArthur's behalf by issuing a public announcement to the starving people who had fought and whose relatives had died in his name to 'forget individual selfish desires' and 'carry out the beautiful tradition of our country, namely the family state'.^{lxxix} Nor did such behaviour change with the promulgation of the postwar constitution early the following year. In a further attempt to curry favour with his foreign overlords, the same monarch who would subsequently be portrayed by enthusiastic western chroniclers of Japan's postwar 'success story' as a 'modern' symbol of state deprived of political power recommended in September 1947 through imperial aide Terasaki Hidenori to William Sebald, MacArthur's Political Advisor, that he wished to see the enormously unpopular military occupation of Okinawa prolonged indefinitely.^{lxxx} It was becoming clear that, constitution or not, Hirohito saw his survival and role as a monarch primarily in terms of doing the bidding of his masters rather than reflecting the will or interests of the people whose representative he was now constitutionally supposed to have become.

Whether the Emperor survived because of MacArthur's disenchantment with the democratic process or whether it was the decision to retain him that made MacArthur's change-of-policy towards the Japanese people more difficult to avoid seems (at least to me) something of a chicken-and-egg problem. But, taken together, the two developments had a huge effect in undermining real prospects for reform. In the words of one of the leading western historians on the subject:

'American policymakers acted on the premise that the monarchic principle and western style democracy were theoretically compatible. That very premise, however, blunted the full potential of the democratic revolution that Washington had just initiated. The reformed Japanese monarchy, which dissembled on the question of its own morality and which the United States supported, immediately tilted the struggle for democracy in postwar Japan in favour of the "moderate" politicians of the *ancien* regime. The conservatives would always be tempted thereafter to utilize the symbol monarchy not only to reinstate continuity but to serve their own political purposes whenever the need arose, just as MacArthur had. Of all the consequences that followed from the American decision to exonerate Hirohito of war responsibility, that was surely the most momentous'.^{lxxxix}

This was not the end of the story, however. Although the retention of the monarchy did eventually lead to a blunting of the democratic revolution, the long-term survival of the monarchy depended upon the shape of a new national charter that would institutionalize many of the earlier democratization and demilitarization directives. Until that time, MacArthur, as Supreme Commander, could use the Emperor to govern Japan if he deemed necessary. But MacArthur was informed by Washington in January 1946 that 'your authority to make policy decisions on constitutional reform' would only continue 'substantially unimpaired until the Far Eastern Commission (an inter allied policymaking body for Japan under Washington's aegis that was slated

to go into operation at the end of February) promulgates its own decisions on this subject'.^{lxxxii} Neither the US government nor its allied partners had come out in favour of preserving the Japanese monarchy. Furthermore, the public opinion of all allied countries was strongly in favour of trying or executing Hirohito as a war criminal.^{lxxxiii} It was therefore quite possible that, unless GHQ could resolve this problem before the Far Eastern Commission came into operation, the Allied home governments would, through the Far Eastern Commission, either insist upon a new constitution that was republican or insist upon Hirohito's abdication.

In October 1945, MacArthur had entrusted the whole process of constitutional reform to two committees of very conservative Japanese establishment figures with close links to the government. Their proposals came nowhere near the terms of the Potsdam Declaration surrender terms that mandated 'freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought', 'respect for fundamental human rights', 'the removal of all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people' and 'the establishment in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government'.^{lxxxiv} The committee members also had no intention even of getting rid of the Meiji Constitution or the 'inviolable' position of the Emperor within it. Partly in response to various GHQ officials' encouragement, a number of Japanese extra-governmental groups started 'freely expressing the will of the Japanese people' on this subject, generating by the end of 1945 a wide variety of alternative drafts, including republican charters, in which notions of popular sovereignty and individual rights were more solidly enshrined. So when one of Japan's national dailies 'scooped' one of the committee's drafts

(the other committee disbanded when its chairman, Konoe, committed suicide) and revealed to the public that it simply sought to preserve the *status quo*, MacArthur knew he had to act before the pressure for more radical change both within Japan and without would result in the implementation of constitutional arrangements over which he had no control and in which neither the Emperor system nor Hirohito might figure.^{lxxxv}

It was therefore as a result of this pressure ‘from below’ and ‘from without’ (i.e. allied public opinion) that MacArthur felt forced to instruct GHQ Government Section to produce a draft of its own that would be based upon three principles: i) preservation of the Emperor; ii) abolition of war as a right of the nation and prohibition of Japanese armed forces on its soil; and iii) the abolition of the peerage. New Dealers and progressives within Government Section utilized these instructions, as well as many of the draft charters produced by the Japanese extra-governmental groups, to produce a constitution (in less than ten days) that contained novel and sometimes far-reaching provisions concerning popular sovereignty, individual rights, equality of the sexes and the renunciation of war.^{lxxxvi} But that the Supreme Commander could go from the idea of no new constitution (October 1945) to accepting what in many ways was a very progressive national charter (February 1946) was not because of any personal commitment to radical democracy (especially for Japan) but because he realized that such would be the political price he – as well as the Japanese Old Guard – would have to pay to be assured of preserving the monarch.^{lxxxvii} In Imperial Vice Chamberlain Kinoshita’s words (March 5), MacArthur was ‘frantically.... trying to make Japan proclaim the democratized constitution which

GHQ's Government Section made' in order to 'head off the international mood of opposition to the Emperor System'.^{lxxxviii}

Efforts to undermine the progressive thrust of the constitution occurred almost as soon as the government was entrusted to translate the GHQ draft into Japanese.^{lxxxix} If only better to argue that a draft drawn up entirely by foreigners could actually represent the 'freely expressed will' of the Japanese people, GHQ anticipated and welcomed amendments to the document as it went through the ratification process in the Diet. But the government liaisons with GHQ tried to take advantage of this to use strange Japanese terminology to qualify notions of popular sovereignty and sought to redefine the constitution's meaning in terms of 'maintaining the Emperor's authority as the centre of the life of the people' and 'source of their spiritual guidance'. They also tried to undermine the permanence of all individual liberties and rights in the charter by making them 'subject to the law'.^{xc} While GHQ officials saw through some of this, they were, unfortunately for minorities in Japan, tricked by chief government negotiator Sato Tatsuo when he told them that there was no need for a clause guaranteeing equal protections for resident aliens since such guarantees existed elsewhere in the constitution. In fact they existed only for the Japanese (or *kokumin*). Resulting in the loss by Koreans and Chinese in Japan of rights they had previously at least theoretically enjoyed as members of the Japanese empire (such as the ballot), this marked the first shot in an unnecessary and often tragic postwar story of official discrimination and harassment, as the government successfully utilized what was to others a democratic constitution to institutionalize and deepen (often with the help of Occupation armed forces) the process of lowering non-Japanese Asians to a sub-human level.^{xc}

Much, however, remained, including a no-war clause that even according to conservatives such as Yoshida Shigeru unequivocally renounced Japan's involvement in all wars, including those of self-defence.^{xcii} But it was as the rest of the Occupation's reform program continued to unravel with the onset of the Cold War, the Reverse Course, the post-Occupation Japan-US Security Treaty, the creation of the euphemistically-termed Self-Defence Forces and the endless pressure from a United States now wedded to the idea of preserving Japan as a bastion of Free World capitalism to 'shoulder a fairer share' of the country's 'defence requirements' that the continuing existence of the unrevised constitution and its no-war clause became a crucial checking mechanism for the majority of Japanese people opposed to these developments. As a result, a charter that the well-respected British authority on Japan, Sir George Sansom, dismissed as 'rather idiotic' became of overriding importance, as an institutional means and rallying cry, for the development of a genuine grass-roots, popular democracy.^{xciii} As can be seen from the union movement of the late-1940's, the peace movement of the 1950's, the anti-nuclear and student movements of the 1960's, the consumer movement of the 1970s, the anti-fingerprint movement of the 1980's, the war victims' efforts of the 1990s and the women's movement throughout the postwar era, many people, Japanese and foreign, have stepped forward to advance the cause.

As another reminder of the importance of the constitution's existence, the Monarchy has also survived. In principle the constitutional representative of the popular will, the Emperor has nevertheless remained a symbol of the more conservative (and racial) idea of the 'unity of his people', with his descent from the Gods affirmed as recently as 1990, with traditional Shinto accession ceremonies for the new

Emperor Heisei taking place at the shrine to the Sun Goddess at Ise. As a result of what Kido Koichi had described as the ‘eternal scar’ resulting from his failure to take responsibility for the war, the long years of Hirohito’s postwar rule also witnessed a growing imperial isolation from his subjects and the gradual re-imposition of a taboo upon all discussion of his and his family’s activities. In one of the few attempts to bring down this ‘chrysanthemum curtain’, the mayor of Nagasaki in 1988 and 1989 – in answer to a question from a communist party assemblyman about Hirohito’s war responsibility – publicly upbraided himself for sending troops under him to die for the Emperor during the war, and stated later to journalists that, had Hirohito ‘resolved to end the war earlier, there would have been no Battle of Okinawa and no nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki’. But his efforts at self-examination and an honest reassessment of the wartime past resulted in death threats from rightist groups culminating in an assassination attempt in 1990 in which he was seriously wounded.^{xciv} Although Hirohito went to the grave in 1989 with his own war responsibility unexamined, the postwar constitution survives and the issue of war responsibility shows no sign of going away. In this context, it is particularly ironic that, having survived the Showa era, the 1947 charter and the Emperor System that its initial promulgation was so effective in preserving remain two of the most durable features of modern Japanese politics, seemingly diametrically opposed but also inextricably inter-linked.

Endotes

ⁱ In writing this paper, I have relied largely on the work of four authorities in this field. First, Takemae Eiji, whose pioneering work on GHQ is expected to be published in English in an expanded form by Athlone Press in 2000 under the title, *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and Its Legacy* (adapted and translated by Robert Ricketts and myself); four important articles on the Emperor by Herbert Bix that were written between 1991 and 1995, in particular, ‘The Showa Emperor’s “Monologue”

and the Problem of War Responsibility', *Journal of Japanese Studies* 18.2 (summer 1992); Nakamura Masanori, *The Japanese Monarchy: Ambassador Joseph Grew and the Making of the 'Symbol Emperor System', 1931-1991*, Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1992; and especially John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, W.W. Norton and Co, New York, 1999, a masterful and encyclopedic account of the early Occupation years. Whenever possible, I have quoted sources directly.

ⁱⁱ For text of Potsdam Declaration, see U.S. Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, Washington D.C., Government Printing Office (hereafter cited as FRUS), 1945, Vol. 2, pp. 1284-89; Government Section, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, *Political Reorientation of Japan: September 1945 to September 1948* (hereafter cited as PRJ), Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1949, Vol. 2, pp. 423-39.

ⁱⁱⁱ The main example of this was a placard raised by a communist party member during the Food Mayday protests of 19 May 1946 in front of the imperial palace that said: 'Imperial Edict: The Emperor system has been preserved. I, the Emperor, have eaten my fill, but you, his subjects, may starve to death! Signed: (Imperial Seal)'. Although alarmed at this action and slow to protect the free-speech rights of the demonstrator, SCAP did eventually prevail on the Japanese government to substitute the *lese majeste* charge with the lesser charge of libel. A month earlier, as part of a delegation from an earlier food protest rally that was allowed to meet with Prime Minister Shidehara, the communist leader, Tokuda Kyuichi, told the premier that he was 'too fat' to be living within the monthly financial limit that the government had set for Japanese to abide by, an action that incited sufficiently angry words by other members of the delegation for Shidehara to flee the room in fright. For both incidents, see Kodansha, ed., *Showa: Niman Nichi no Zenkiroku*, Tokyo, Kodansha, 1989, Vol. 7, pp. 238-39, 260; Joe Moore, *Japanese Workers and the Struggle for Power, 1945-1947*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1983, pp. 170-77; and (for a contemporary account) Mark Gayn, *Japan Diary*, New York, William Sloane, 1948, pp. 164-69.

^{iv} See, for instance, Eto Jun, *Mo Hitotsu no Sengo-shi*, Kodansha, 1978; *Wasureta Koto to Wasureareta Koto*, Bungei Shunju, 1979; and *Senryo Shiroku*, Kodansha, 1981-82, Vols. 1-4. For discussion of Potsdam 'revisionism' and its inconsistencies, see Takemae, 2000, Chapter 5.

^v For overview of the early political reforms, see Takemae, 2000, Chapter 6.

^{vi} Kawai Kazuo, *Japan's American Interlude*, University of Chicago Press, 1960.

^{vii} For overview of both military occupations, see Takemae, 2000, Chapters 2 and 3. For Russian occupation of the Kuriles and Sakhalin, see Nemuroshi-hen ed., *Nemuroshi Somubu Roydo Taisaku-Gakari, Hoppo Ryodo: Shusen Zengo no Kiroku*, Vols., 1 and 2, Nemuro City, 1970, 1971; Onuma Yasuaki, *Saharin Kimim: Sengo Sekinin no Tenkei*, Chuko Shinso, 1992; Chishima Hobomai Shoto Kyojusha Renmei ed., *Moto Tomm ga Uttaeru Warera Hoppo Yuonto: Soren Senryohen*, Chishima Habomai Shoto Kyojusha Renmei, 1988; Suizu Mitsuru: *Hoppo Royodo*

Dakkan E No Michi, Nihon Kogyo Shimbunsha, 1979; Intelligence Section, Hokkaido Police Agency, *Soren-Gun Senryoka ni Okeru Sento Oyobi Habmai Rijima Gaikyo*; D.F. Ustinov, *Istoriia Vtoroi Mirovoi Voyny* – 2, Moscow, 1980; Marc. S. Gallicchio, 'The Kuriles Controversy: U.S. Diplomacy in the Soviet-Japan Border Dispute, 1941-1956', in *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 60, No. 1, 1991; and John J. Stephan, *The Russian Far East: A History*, Stanford University Press, 1994; and *History of the Kuril Islands*, Clarendon Press, 1974. For US occupation of Okinawa, see Ota Masahide, *Soshi Okinawa-Sen*, Iwanami Shoten, 1982; May 1949 Report by Douglas L. Oliver on conditions in the Ryukyus, *FRUS*, 1949, Vol. 7; GHQ/SCAP and FECOM, *Selected Data on the Occupation of Japan*, Tokyo, 1950; Shindo Eiichi, 'Bunkatsu Sareta Ryodo', in *Sekai*, April 1979, pp. 31-51; and Arasaki Moriteru, *Okinawa Hasnsen-Jinushi*, Kokubunken, 1995.

viii For a select bibliography of works concerning the Burakumin, Ainu and the general condition of minorities in Japan during the Occupation and post-Occupation eras, see: Michael Weiner, ed., *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity*, Routledge, 1997; *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan*, Routledge, 1994; Ian Neary, 'Burakumin in Contemporary Japan' in Weiner, *op cit*; Kayano Shigeru, *Our Land was a Forest: An Ainu Memoir*, Westview Press, 1994; Kaatarina Sjoberg, *The Return of the Ainu: Cultural Mobilization and Practice of Ethnicity in Japan*, Harwood Academic, 1993; Watanabe Toshio, *Gerndaishi no Naka no Buraku Mondai*, Kaiho Shuppansha, 1998; 'Senryoki no Buraku Mondai', in *Buraku Kaihoshi: Fukuoka*, No. 58, June 1990; 'Senryoki no Jinken Hoshō to Buraku Mondai', in *Buraku Kaiho Kenkyu*, No. 73, 1990; Roger I. Yoshino, *The Invisible Minority: Japan's Burakumin*, Buraku Kaiho Kenkyusho, 1977; Takakura Sei'ichiro, 'The Ainu of Northern Japan: A Study in Conquest and Acculturation', *Transactions of the Philosophical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 50, No. 4, 1960; Biratoricho-hen (ed.), *Hidaka Chiho ni okeru Ainu-kei no Seikatsu-Jitai to Sono Mondaiten*, 1965; George De Vos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste and Culture and Personality*, University of California Press, 1966; GHQ/SCAP, *History of the Non-Military Activities of the Occupation of Japan*, Vol. 6: 'Treatment of Foreign Nationals', Tokyo, 1951; Tanaka Hiroshi, *Zainichi Gaikokujin: Ho no Kabe, Kokoro no Kabe*, Iwanami Shinsho, 1995; and Hiroshi Komai, *Migrant Workers in Japan*, Kegan Paul International, 1995.

ix For plight of Koreans during the Occupation, see Edward Wagner, *The Korean Minority in Japan, 1904-1950*, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1951; Onuma Yasuaki, *Tan'itsu Minzoku Shakai o Koete: Zainichi Kankoku-Chosenjin to Shutsunyukoku Kanri-Taisei*, Toshindo, 1992; Pak Kyong-sik, *Kaiho-go: Zainichi Chosenjin Undo*, San'ichi Shobo, 1989; W. Donald Smith, 'Democracy Denied: The American Repression of Korean Education in Occupied Japan', unpublished essay, Graduate School of Asian History, University of Washington, July 1993; David Conde, 'The Korean Minority in Japan', *Far Eastern Survey*, 26 February, 1947; Kim Tae-gi, *"Sengo" Zainichi-Chosenjin Mondai no Kigen: SCAP no Tai-Zainichi Chosenjin Seisaku, 1945-1952*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Hitotsubashi University, March 1996; Cheong Sung-hwa, *The Politics of Anti-Japanese Sentiment in Korea: Japanese-South Korean relations Under American Occupation, 1945-1952*, Greenwood Press, 1991; Robert Ricketts, 'GHQ no Tai-Zainichi Chosenjin Seisaku o Tsukutta Otoko-tachi', in *Wako Daigaku Ningen-Kenkei Gakubu Kiyo*, No. 2, 1997; Changsoo Lee

and George De Vos, *Koreans in Japan: Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation*, University of California Press, 1981; Kajimura Hideki, 'Confronting Japanese Racism: Toward a Korean Identity', in *Japan-Asia Quarterly Review (AMPO)*, Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2, 1990; and Sonia Ryang, *North Koreans in Japan: Language, Ideology, and Identity*, Westview Press, 1997.

^x For Korean a-bomb victims, see Lisa Yoneyama, 'Memory Matters: Hiroshima's Korean Atom Bomb Memorial and the Politics of Ethnicity', in Laura Hein, Mark Selden, eds., *Living with the Bomb: American and Japanese Cultural Conflicts in the Nuclear Age*, M.E. Sharpe, 1997. For *hibakusha*, generally, see Committee for the Compilation of Materials on Damage Caused by the Atomic Bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, *Hiroshima and Nagasaki: the Physical, Medical, and Social Effects of the Atomic Bombings*, Iwanami Shoten, 1981; S. Pak, K. Kwak and W. Sin, *Hibakusha Kankokujin*, Asahi Shimbunsha, 1975; Sodei Rinjiro, *Were We the enemy? American Survivors of Hiroshima*, Westview Press, 1988; Horiba Kiyoko, *Genbaku: Hyogen to Ken'etsu – Nihonjin wa Do Taioshita ka*, Tokyo, Asahi Sensho, 1995; Glenn D. Hook, 'Roots of Nuclearism: Censorship and Reportage of Atomic Damage and Casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki', *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 23 (January-March 1991); Monica Braw, *The Atomic Bomb Suppressed: American Censorship in Occupied Japan*, New York, M.E. Sharpe, 1991; and John W. Dower, 'The Bombed: Hiroshimas and Nagasakis in Japanese Memory', in *Hiroshima in History and Memory*, ed. Michael J. Hogan, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

^{xi} For 'comfort women', see Tanaka Yuki, *Hidden Horrors; Japanese War Crimes in World War II*, Westview Press, 1998 (also for POW issues); George Hicks, *The Comfort Women*, Tokyo, Yenbooks, 1995; 'Japan, Land of Quiet Apartheid', *The International Herald Tribune*, 10 March, 1992; Yamada Mieko, *Senryogun Ianfu*, Kojinsha, 1992; Mizuno Hiroshi, ed., *Shi ni Nozonde Uttaeru*, Togosha, 1982; Nishi Kyoko, *Senryoka no Nihon Fujin Seisaku*, Domesu Shuppan, 1985; and Yoshimi Yoshiaki, ed., *Jugun-Ianfu Shiryoshu*, Otsuki Shoten, 1992.

^{xii} Estimate of 'comfort women' numbers from Yoshimi Yoshiaki. For discussion of differing response to Japan's mistreatment of white as opposed to Asian women, see Takemae, 2000, Chapter 6.

^{xiii} For POWs, see Olive Checkland, *Humanitarianism and the Emperor's Japan, 1877-1977*, St. Martin's Press, 1994; B.V.A. Roling and C.F. Rutter, eds., *The Tokyo Judgment: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE), 29 April 1946 -12 November 1948*, Amsterdam, APA University Press, 1977, Vol. 1, p. 385 (for dramatically higher number of Allied POW deaths in captivity under the Japanese than under the Germans); Gavan McCormack and Hank Nelson, eds., *The Burma-Thailand Railway: Memory and History*, St. Leonards, Australia, Allen and Unwin, 1993; Gavan Dawes, *Prisoners of the Japanese; POWs of World War II in the Pacific*, New York, William Morrow, 1994; and Robert La Forte, Ronald Marcello, and Richard Himmel, eds., *With Only the Will to Live: Accounts of Americans in Japanese Prison Camps, 1941-1945*, Wilmington, Delaware, SR Books, 1994; for first-hand account of a Japanese POW experience at the hands of the British, see Aida Yuji, *Prisoner of the British – a Japanese Soldier's Experiences in Burma*, Cresset Press, 1966.

^{xiv} On this problem, see Awaya Kentaro, *Tokyo Saiban Ron*, Otsuki Shoten, 1989, pp. 286-87; and Utsumi Aiko, *Chosenjin BC-kyu Senpan no Koroku*, Tokyo, Keiso Shobo, 1982 (for Koreans and Formosans being tried for war crimes in the forced service of the Japanese); and 'Japanese Army Internment Policies for Enemy Civilians During the Asia-Pacific War', in Donald Denoon, *et al*, eds., *Multicultural Japan: Paleolithic to Postmodern*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

^{xv} For rehabilitation of suspected, indicted or convicted Japanese war criminals, see Dower, 1999, chapter 15. For the activities and rehabilitation of those involved in bacteriological warfare atrocities, see Peter Williams and David Wallace, *Unit 731: Japan's Secret Biological Warfare in World War II*, The Free Press, 1989; and Sheldon H. Harris, *Factories of Death: Japanese Biological Warfare, 1932—45, and the American Cover-up*, Routledge, 1994.

^{xvi} For the repatriation of Koreans in Sakhalin, see Onuma Yasuaki, *Saharin Kinmin: Sengo Sekinin no Tenkei*, Chuko Shinsho, 1992.

^{xvii} For brief overview of the problem as a whole, see Takemae, 2000, Chapter 10.

^{xviii} For primary sources especially relevant to a reconsideration of Hirohito's role, see in particular Kinoshita Michio, *Sokkin Nisshi*, Tokyo, Bungei Shunjusha, 1990; and Terasaki Hidenari and Mariko Terasaki Miller, eds., *Showa Tenno Dokuhahuroku – Terasaki Hidenari Goyogakari Nikki*, Tokyo, Bungei Shunjusha, 1991. For short responses to this script, see *Rekishisho Tsushin* 75, February 1991, Tokyo, Rekishisho Konwakai and *Bungei Shunju*, January 1991. For more extended analysis, see Fujiwara Akira, Awaya Kentaro, Yoshida Yutaka and Yamada Akira, eds., *Tettei-Kensho: Showa Tenno "Dokuhakuroku,"* Otsuki Shoten, 1991; for analysis in English, see Herbert Bix, 'The Showa Emperor's 'Monologue' and the Problem of War Responsibility', *Journal of Japanese Studies* 18.2 (summer 1992). For more critical general historical scholarship towards the Emperor and his responsibility for the war, see Yoshida Yutaka, *Showa Tenno no Shusen shi*, Iwanami Shinsho, 1992; Fujiwara Akira, *Jugonen Senso to Tenno*, Tokyo, Azumino Shoten, 1988; 'Tenno to Senso Shido', in *Kagaku to Shiso* 71 (January 1989); Hata Ikuhiko, *Hirohito Tenno no Itsutsu no Ketsudan*, Tokyo, Kodansha, 1984; Chimoto Hideki, *Tennosei no Shinryaku Sekinin to Sengo Sekinin*, Tokyo, Aoki Shoten, 1990; Yamada Akira, *Showa Tenno no Senso Shido*, Tokyo, Showa Shuppan, 1990; and Awaya Kentaro, 'Emperor Showa's Accountability for War', *Japan Quarterly* 38.4 (October-December 1991).

^{xix} For brief description of Meiji Constitution and suggestions for further introductory reading, see Janet E. Hunter, *Concise Dictionary of Modern Japanese History*, pp. 39 and 125-26. See particularly the statement, 'the Meiji constitution is regarded as having provided the legal basis for the "emperor system"... by establishing the framework within which non parliamentary elites... could legally dominate national politics' (p. 126).

^{xx} Ito Hirobumi, *Commentaries*, 1889.

^{xxi} *Kokutai no Hongi*, Ministry of Education, 1938. See also Wilhelmus H.M. Creemers, *State Shinto After World War II*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968, p. 123. For a concise summary of the development of the theocratic powers of the post-1868 Japanese monarchs, see Dower, 1999, pp. 601-603 (note 25).

^{xxii} Ito, *op cit*.

^{xxiii} Although one of the arguments of this paper is that the Emperor used his extensive powers to become an important political 'player' during the pre-surrender years, exactly how and the extent to which he actually intervened in the political process during that time is still a matter of debate. For a comparatively 'minimalist' interpretation emphasizing Hirohito's self-imposed restrictions upon playing a political role, see Stephen S. Large, *Emperor Hirohito and Showa Japan: A Political Biography*, London and New York, Routledge, 1992; for a contrasting view of the behaviour of the Japanese Emperor, see Herbert Bix articles: 'The Showa Emperor's "Monologue" and the Problem of War Responsibility', *Journal of Japanese Studies* 18-2 (summer 1992); 'Emperor Hirohito's War', *History Today* 41 (December 1991); 'Inventing the "Symbol Monarchy" in Japan, 1945-1952', *Journal of Japanese Studies* 21.2 (summer 1995); and 'Japan's Delayed Surrender: A Reinterpretation', *Diplomatic History* 19.2 (Spring 1995).

^{xxiv} See in particular Kido Koichi, *Kido Koichi Nikki*, Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1966, Vol 2, pp. 1230-31, Bix, 1992, p. 304. See also 1946 essay of Miyoshi Tatsuji, quoted in Tsurumi Shunsuke and Nakagawa Roppei, eds., *Tenno Hyakuwa*, Tokyo, Chikuma Shoten, 1989, Vol. 2, pp. 323-31, as well as Bix, p. 314.

^{xxv} The official title of this proclamation was the 'Rescript to Promote the National Destiny', English translation of which can be found in US Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1946*, Vol. 8, pp. 134-35. In a later interview, the Emperor stated that the 'primary objective' of the document was not the renunciation of divinity – reference to which was tucked away toward the end of the document – but the reaffirmation of Emperor Meiji's Charter Oath of 1868. For an extensive reconsideration of the drafting and meaning of this important document, see Dower, 1999, pp. 308-318. See also Takemae Eiji, 2000, Chapter 8.

^{xxvi} Quoted in Tsurumi and Nakagawa, *Tenno Hyakuwa*, Vol. 2, p. 130.

^{xxvii} Willaim P. Woodard, *The Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952, and Japanese Religions*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1972, p. 254.

^{xxviii} For text of the final American draft, see Government Section, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, *Political Reorientation of Japan: September 1945 to September 1948* (hereafter *PRJ*), Washington D.C., US Government Printing Office, 1949, Vol. 2, pp. 625-36. It should also perhaps be noted here that the traditional dating system of calculating the date and time in accordance with the year of the reigning Emperor (1945 was Showa 20, for instance) was retained. Also, the constitution upheld the more martial Meiji and post-Meiji tradition of allowing only males to succeed to the throne, in disregard of the fact that empresses had been allowed to reign in earlier times.

^{xxix} For text of SWNCC 150 and JCS 1380/15, see *PRJ*, 2: pp. 413, 423-39. See also appendix of Edward M. Martin, *The Allied Occupation of Japan*, New York, American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1948. For discussion of the origins, drafting and terms of the two documents, see particularly Takemae, 2000, Chapter 5 and Theodore Cohen, *Remaking Japan: The American Occupation as New Deal*, New York, Free Press, 1987, pp. 4, 10-13. It should also be noted that, as late as January 1946, the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC 228) told MacArthur that the Japanese 'should be encouraged to abolish the Emperor Institution or to reform it along more democratic lines'. See US State Department, *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter *FRUS*), 1946, Washington D.C., US Government Printing Office, Vol. 8, pp. 99-102.

^{xxx} For opinion polls, see Roger Buckley, 'Britain and the Emperor: The Foreign Office and Constitutional Reform in Japan, 1945-1946', *Modern Asian Studies* 12.4 (1978), p. 554; Hadley Cantril, ed., *Public Opinion, 1935-1946*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1951. For summary of international opinion concerning the emperor, see Kiyoko Takeda, *The Dual Image of the Japanese Emperor*, New York, New York University Press, 1988. See also Takemae, 2000, Chapter 7.

^{xxxi} The notion that 'gangster militarists had betrayed their sacred Emperor' was systematically developed before the war had ended by senior MacArthur military aide, General Bonner Fellers, in a study entitled 'Answer to Japan'. Original in Bonner F. Fellers papers, Hoover Institution of War and Peace, Stanford University, box 1. Quoted at length in Dower, 1999, pp. 282-83.

^{xxxii} See Douglas MacArthur, *Reminiscences*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964, p. 288.

^{xxxiii} The notes of meeting taken by the Emperor's translator, Okumura, were published in Kojima Noboru's article, 'Tenno to Amerika to Taiheiyo Senso', in *Bungei Shunju*, Nov. 1975 (pp. 115-19).

^{xxxiv} The MacArthur telegram can be found in *FRUS*, 1946, 8: 395-97.

^{xxxv} An option that – as discussed later – preoccupied a number of senior politicians and imperial advisors close to the Throne from the autumn of 1945, the issue of whether Hirohito could or should have abdicated as a 'third way' that would entail the acceptance of war responsibility while preserving the institution of the Monarchy is one of the main issues discussed in Nakamura Masanori's study, *The Japanese Monarchy: Ambassador Joseph Grew and the Making of the "Symbol Emperor System," 1931-1991*, Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1992.

^{xxxvi} In late-January 1946, when pressure for his abdication seemed to be reaching a head, Hirohito actually had an Imperial scholar lecture to him about an Emperor who abdicated in his early thirties (i.e. not far from Hirohito's own age) at the end of the ninth century. See Takahashi Hiroshi and Suzuki Kunihiro, *Tennoko no Misshitachi: Senryo to Koshitsu*, Tokyo, Bunshan Bunko, 1989, p. 37-38.

^{xxxvii} See in particular Large, 1992.

xxxviii See U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, *The Effects of Strategic Bombing on Japanese Morale*, Washington D.C.: July 1947, p. 149.

xxxix For these and other instances of anti-imperial sentiment, see Awaya Kentaro, ed., *Shiryo: Nihon Gendai Shi*, Tokyo, Otsuki Shoten, 1980, Vol. 2 (*Haisen Chokugo no Seiji to Shakai*), pp. 40, 87, 94, 198, 205, 218, 229, 246-48, 251-52, 336-37; Vol. 3, p 169. Reference to diapers in holy places in Nakamura, *op. cit.*, p. 176. See also Tsurumi and Nakagawa, eds., *Tenno Hyakuwa*, Vol. 1, p. 571 and John W. Dower, 'Sensational Rumors, Seditious Graffiti, and the Nightmares of the Thought Police' in Dower, *Japan in War and Peace: Selected Essays*, New York: The New Press, 1993, pp. 101-54.

xi The government was, to the contrary, sufficiently concerned about the number and content of these reports to increase the Emperor's personal guard to 4,000. See *Asahi Shimbun*, October 27, 1945.

xli There were reports of the Emperor – even on occasion before as well as after the war ended – being referred to as 'Ten-chan', a not-unfriendly, but in no way respectful, appellation that could be translated as 'little Emp' or 'Empty baby'. There were other reports of the emperor being referred to in very uncomplimentary ('stingy' and 'tight-fisted', in the words of a Japanese seaman, in reaction to an imperial visit to his ship) and sometimes downright scatological ways during and after the war years. See in particular Sodei Rinjiro and Fukushima Juro, eds., *Makkasa: Kiroku – Sengo Nihon no Genten*, Tokyo: Nihon Hoso Shuppan Kyokai, 1982, p. 158; Takahashi Nobuo, *Showa Seso Ryukogo Jiten*, Tokyo: Obunsha, 1986; Akira Iwasaki, 'The Occupied Screen', *Japan Quarterly*, Vol. 25, no. 3 (July-September 1978); and October 1980 discussion between Awaya Kentaro and Watanabe Kiyoshi published in Awaya, 1980.

xlii See Civil Intelligence Section, SCAP, *Occupational Trends: Japan and Korea*, 9 January 1946, pp. 4-5; 23 January 1946, p. 18.

xliii US Department of State, *Records of Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations* (United States Senate, 78th Congress, Second Session, 12 and 13 December 1944), US Government Printing Office, Washington, 1944, pp. 18-19. For discussion of the Grew 'hive theory', see, among others, Takemae, 2000, Chapter 5; Nakamura, 1992.

xliv Civil Intelligence Section, SCAP, *Occupational Trends: Japan and Korea*, 27 February 1946, p. 15.

xlvi The claim of Kumazawa Hiromichi and various of his relatives to the imperial throne is documented in Kodansha, ed., *Showa: Niman Nichi no Zenkiroku* (hereafter *SNNZ*), Tokyo, Kodansha, 1989, Vol. 7, p. 200. See also 18 January 1946 edition of US Army magazine *Stars and Stripes* and 21 January 1946 edition of *Life* magazine, pp. 32-33.

xlvi *SNNZ*, Vol. 7., pp. 190-91.

^{xlvii} The report is contained in the 8 November 1945 entry in the diary of Vice Chamberlain Kinoshita Michio. See Kinoshita Michio, *Sokkin Nisshi*, Tokyo, Bungei Shunjusha, 1990, p. 34. See also Fujiwara Akira, 'Tosuiken to Tenno', in *Kindai Tennosei no Kenkyu, II*, ed. Toyama Shigeki, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1987, p. 219.

^{xlviii} Prince Higashikuni first recommended that Hirohito abdicate in a private meeting with the Emperor in the first week of October 1945. On 27 February 1946, the *Yomiuri Hochi* newspaper reported that Higashikuni had informed an Associated Press reporter that abdication was being discussed at the highest levels. See Kinoshita, p. 12; Hata Ikuhiko, 'Tenno no Shinsho', *Bungei Shunju*, October 1978, p. 376; *New York Times*, 4 March, 1946.

^{xlix} For Konoe's remarks to the press, see *Asahi Shimbun*, 25 October 1945. Prince Mikasa's remarks are contained in the diary of then Welfare Minister and future Prime Minister Ashida Hitoshi, *Ashida Hitoshi Nikki*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1986, Vol. 1, p. 82, quoted also in Bix, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 21-2 (summer 1995), p. 338. For Kido Koichi's remarks, see *Kido Koichi Nikki*, Tokyo, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1966, Vol. 2, pp. 1230-31, quoted also in Bix, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 18-2 (summer 1992), p. 304. For Mibuchi's remarks, see *Shukan Asahi* for 16 May 1948, reprinted in '*Shukan Asahi*' no Showa Shi, Tokyo, Asahi Shimbunsha, 1989. Vol. 2, pp 112 (and generally pp 110-121). For an overview of these and other prominent Japanese people's remarks about why the Emperor should abdicate, see Dower, 1999, especially pp. 320-28.

ⁱ For post-occupation scholarship supporting theory that Emperor was a 'peace-loving' monarch with virtually no real prewar power, see for instance appraisals of western scholarship on Japan periodically undertaken by John Whitney Hall in the 1960s and early 1970s. That this conflicted with the views of GHQ officials (even those who wished to preserve Emperor for pragmatic and political reasons), see particularly Brigadier General Elliott Thorpe's comment: 'now I know he (Hirohito) had his hand in the cookie jar, and he wasn't any innocent little child. But he was of great use to us, and that was the basis on which I recommended... that we keep him'. Although supporting the decision to exempt Hirohito from war crimes charges and retain the monarchy in Japan, SCAP Political Advisor George Atcheson nevertheless informed President Truman in early 1946 that he believed that 'the Emperor is a war criminal' and 'that the Emperor system must disappear if Japan is ever to be really democratic'. See 'Oral Reminiscences of Brigadier General Elliott R. Thorpe', 29 May, 1977, RG 49, Box 6, MacArthur Memorial, Norfolk, VA, p. 8; for Atcheson, see U.S. Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1946*, Vol. 8, pp. 87-92.

ⁱⁱ For an examination of the Emperor's role during the last months of the war – particularly with reference to the Konoe Memorial in February 1945 and the decision to surrender in August – see particularly Bix, 1995, pp. 197-225; and Bix, 1992, pp. 302-13.

ⁱⁱⁱ Konoe quote from collection of papers in Konoe Fumimaro, *Ushinawareshi Seiji*, Tokyo, Nihon Denpo Tsushinsha, 1946, p. 143; for English translation, see Bix,

1992, p. 313. For discussion on how the Emperor's 'Monologue' reveals Hirohito's personal support for the exploits of the Kwantung Army in China, see Bix, 1992, pp. 338-47.

^{liii} The Kido Diary and the Harada-Saionji memoirs, compiled by the personal secretary of Prince Saionji, the last of the '*genro*' – or 'elder statesmen' – who died in 1940, first surfaced during the Tokyo war crimes trials' proceedings between 1946-48, and have since been published in full by Kido Koichi Kenkyukai, ed., as *Kido Koichi Nikki*, Tokyo, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1966 and Harada Kumao, *Saionji Ko to Seikyoku*, Iwanami Shoten 1951-52, 1956 (9 volumes). The 'Monologue' was a recollection drawn up by the Emperor and select aides between 18 March and 8 April 1946 of the key decisions of his reign in case Hirohito should be questioned by IMTFE prosecutors. Although the document was not utilized at the war crimes trial since Hirohito was never questioned even in pretrial hearings, it surfaced somewhat fortuitously in 1990 from the attic of the U.S. home of the daughter of Terasaki Hidenari, a Foreign Ministry diplomat then attached to the Palace to coordinate the anticipated translation of the 'Monologue' into English who was married to a distant cousin of General Bonner Fellers, aide and confidant of General MacArthur. Causing something of a sensation when published in installments in the Japanese popular press in 1990, the document was subsequently printed in book form as Terasaki Hidenari and Mariko Terasaki Miller, eds., *Showa Tenno Dokuhakuroku – Terasaki Hidenari Goyogakari Nikki* (Tokyo, Bungei Shunjusha, 1991).

^{liv} Although, in John Dower's words, the imperial recollections in the Monologue 'by no means amount(ed) to an acknowledgment of personal responsibility' and were in fact 'used' by Hirohito 'to lay the onus for disastrous policies on his subordinates', 'this unprecedented recitation offered a window into his exceptionally detailed knowledge of personalities, procedures, and concrete decisions at the highest levels' (Dower, 1999, p. 326). This, together with incidents such as that reported by Harada of Hirohito's castigation of his War Minister in July 1939 as a 'blockhead' and a 'fool' and his refusal to meet directly with him as a result (Harada, *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, pp. 13-14), suggests, at the very least, that – unlike the House of Windsor in twentieth century Britain – the Emperor 'ruled' as well as 'reigned'. For more detailed discussion of how the Monologue reveals the nature of Hirohito's prewar leadership role, see especially Bix, *Journal of Asian Studies*, 1992 and Fujiwara Akira, Awaya Kentaro, Yoshida Yutaka and Yamada Akira, *Showa Tenno 'Dokuhakuroku'*, Tokyo, Otsuki Shoten, 1991.

^{lv} Comments from an essay entitled 'The Emperor Should Abdicate Quickly', that was published in the June 1946 issue of the magazine *Shincho*. For full text in Japanese, see Tsurumi and Nakagawa, *Tenno Hyakuwa*, vol. 2, pp. 323-31; for extended excerpts in English, see Bix, 1992, p. 314.

^{lvi} Kido's reference to the Emperor bearing war responsibility can be found in Kido Koichi, *Kido Koichi Nikki*, Tokyo, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1966, vol. 2, pp. 1230-31; see also Bix, 1992, p. 304. The 1951 message to the Emperor urging abdication as a way of removing an 'eternal scar' was discovered by Awaya Kentaro and first published in 1987; for English translation, see Bix, 1992, pp. 315-16.

^{lvii} Bonner F. Fellers, 'Basic Military Plan for Psychological Warfare Against Japan', 12 April 1945, p.19. Box 3, Fellers papers, Hoover Institution of War and Peace, Stanford University.

^{lviii} Grew's comment appeared in a letter of 25 October 1945 that is quoted in Masanori Nakamura, 1992, p. 85.

^{lix} Keenan's comment is mentioned in Dower, 1999, p. 326.

^{lx} These warnings appeared in Kinoshita's diary, see pp. 160, 163-65. When rumours about the possibility of Hirohito's abdication surfaced in the Japanese and American press as the war crimes trials in Tokyo were drawing to an end in 1948, Bonner Fellers wrote from the United States to Terasaki Hidenari saying that 'frequent mention of the Sire's abdication in the American press' would – if carried out – 'be a victory for all Communists and especially Russians who hold it is naïve to claim that Japan can be democratized so long as the Emperor remains on the throne.' It would also 'identify the Sire as one of the Military clique ... and fix the Sire's place in history as one who sympathized with the war criminals', while 'Japan must have the stabilizing influence which only the Sire can give'. (The letter, dated 28 July 1948, is in the Bonner Fellers papers in the MacArthur Memorial, Norfolk, VA, RG 442, box 4, folder 23). In Dower's words, 'no Japanese royalist could have surpassed such homage to "the Sire"' (Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, p. 328). In a somewhat ironic turn of events that went against what Fellers said in this letter, the Japan Communist Party did not come out formally for the abolition of the Monarchy or Hirohito's abdication, which was in sharp contrast to the recommendations of certain highly conservative commentators and philosophers such as the Buddhist-influenced Tanabe Hajime, who advocated that the Emperor retire and become a symbol of poverty and emptiness and that the wealth of the imperial household be given to the impoverished masses. For the 'moderation' of the Japan Communist Party towards the Emperor, see Mark Gayn, *Japan Diary* (New York, 1948, reprinted Tokyo, Charles E. Tuttle, 1981) and Dower, especially pp 254-73; for the 'immoderate' Tanabe, see Kuyama Yasushi, 'Postwar Japanese Thought: 1945-1960', *Japan Christian Quarterly*, 47.3 (summer 1981), pp. 132-44.

^{lxi} Konoe quote from Roger Buckley, 'Britain and the Emperor: The Foreign Office and Constitutional Reform in Japan, 1945-46', *Modern Asian Studies*, 12.4 (1978), pp. 565-66. Also, entries from Kido diary that could have incriminated the Emperor were deliberately excised before the translation of the documents was prepared for trial, as were some 800 pages of English transcript of private interrogation of Kido (Awaya Kentaro, 'Tokyo Saiban to Tenno', in *Shocho Tennosei to wa Nani ka*, ed. Nihon Gendaishi Kenkyukai, Tokyo, Otsuki Shoten, 1988, pp. 35-36). Like the Emperor's Monologue, the accounts of Kido and Konoe – neither of whom (like their monarch) were prepared to accept any personal responsibility for the consequences of Japanese actions between 1931-45 – were also politically inspired, as were the accounts of most of those they were trying to finger. But whereas, to quote Dower, 'serious interrogation of former high officials concerning the emperor was taboo', 'GHQ's door always was open to the sovereign's defenders'. In this way, 'with the full support of MacArthur's headquarters, the prosecution functioned, in effect, as a defense team for the emperor'. Dower, 1999, p. 326; see also pp. 481-84.

^{lxii} This conversation, which took place on 6 March 1946, was recorded probably by Mizota Shuichi, Yonai's interpreter. See Bix, 1995, pp. 343-44.

^{lxiii} In the wake of a July 1945 Gallup poll indicating that 70% of all Americans wanted the emperor severely punished and even executed as a war criminal and an 18 September Senate resolution to similar effect, the Joint Chiefs instructed MacArthur on 16 October to 'proceed immediately to assemble all available evidence of Hirohito's participation in and responsibility for Japanese violations of international law'. This stance, which clearly provided for the possibility of both Hirohito's abdication and the abolition of the Emperor system entirely, remained unchanged through to the spring of 1946 and the establishment of the Far Eastern Commission. JCS October statement is quoted in Dower, 1999, p. 299; for US policy on the Emperor generally, see *FRUS 1945*, Vol. 6, pp 497-1015; *FRUS 1946*, Vol. 8, pp. 85-604. For international opinion on the emperor, see Kiyoko Takeda, *The Dual Image of the Japanese Emperor*, New York, New York University Press, 1988; see also Buckley, p. 554.

^{lxiv} Bonner F. Fellers, 'Basic Military Plan for Psychological Warfare Against Japan', 12 April 1945, pp. 7, 15. Box 4, Fellers papers, Stanford University.

^{lxv} The phrase comes from the memoirs of Colonel Sidney Mashbir, director of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Service (ATIS), entitled, *I Was an American Spy*, New York, Vantage, 1953 (quoted in Dower, p. 284). On MacArthur's description of Japanese as 'children', see Takemae, 2000, Chapter 8.

^{lxvi} For discussion of the implementation of the surrender and the Allies' peaceful occupation of Japan, see in particular, Takemae, 2000, Chapter 2.

^{lxvii} Fellers, "Answer to Japan," November 1944, pp. 22-23. Box 1, Fellers papers, Stanford University.

^{lxviii} For Grew remark to President Truman (28 May 1945), see *FRUS, 1945*, Vol. 6, p. 545.

^{lxix} Quote from Andrew Roth, *Dilemma in Japan*, Victor Gollancz, 1946, pp. 33-34. Quoted also in Nakamura, 1992, p. 56.

^{lxx} Quote from Ramon Laval, Argentine Consul in Tokyo (until 1943) in 4 December 1944 edition of *Pacific Mail*. See also Nakamura, 1992, p. 57.

^{lxxi} Comment from Thomas A. Bisson's review of Joseph Grew's *Ten Years in Japan* that appeared in 3 June 1944 edition of the *Nation*.. Quoted also in Nakamura, 1992, p. 56.

^{lxxii} For a sympathetic overview of these reforms, see in particular Takemae, 2000, Chapters 6-8.

lxxiii Comment of State Department 'Japan Hand' Joseph Ballentine (quoted in Marlene Mayo, 'American Wartime Planning for Occupied Japan: The Role of the Experts', in *Americans As Proconsuls: United States Military Government in Germany and Japan, 1944-1952*, ed. Robert Wolfe, Carbondale, Southern Illinois Press, 1984, pp. 50). Reference to 'obedient herd' in Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Japan in Defeat: A Report by a Chatham House Study Group*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1945.

lxxiv For overview of the Japanese labour movement and popular protest 1945-47, see in particular, John Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, pp. 254-73; Takemae, Chapter 7; Mark Gayn, *Japan Diary*; and Joe Moore, *Japanese Workers and the Struggle for Power, 1945-1947*, 1983.

lxxv Figures from Miriam Farley, *Aspects of Japan's Labour Problems*, New York, John Day, 1950, pp. 82-85, 97. In Dower's words, this – as well as 'slight additional time.. lost through slowdowns or other tactics.... was negligible when set against capitalist hoarding of strategic materials diversion of goods to the black market, and deliberate heel dragging – to say nothing of the government's colossal ineptitude in addressing the fiscal and economic crisis'. Dower, 1999, p. 258.

lxxvi Government Section, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, *Political Reorientation of Japan, September 1945 to September 1946*, Washington D.C., 1949, Vol. 2, p. 762. MacArthur's 20 May statement is also quoted in Gayn, p. 231 and Moore, p. 184. See also SCAP, GHQ, *Summation: Non-Military Activities in Japan* 8 (May 1946), pp. 29-30, 37.

lxxvii Ii's comments, made a few years later, appeared in the January 1951 edition of *Sekai*. For GHQ position, see Theodore Cohen, *Remaking Japan: The American Occupation as New Deal*, New York, Free Press, 1987, pp. 277-300.

lxxviii Kinoshita, *Sokkin Nisshi*, p. 225. For excerpted translation, see Bix, 1991, p. 333.

lxxix For full translation of the emperor's message, see SCAP/GHQ, *Summation: Non-Military Activities in Japan* 8, May 1946, p. 31. See also Asahi Janaru, ed., *Showa Shi no Shunkan*, Tokyo, Asahi Shimbunsha, 1974, vol. 2, p. 160.

lxxx The Terasaki message, entitled 'Emperor of Japan's Opinion Concerning the Future of the Ryukyu Islands' invited the US military to remain in Okinawa for 'up to 50 years, or even longer' after the signing of a peace treaty as a means of countering Soviet and Chinese influence in Japan. In a clear-cut intervention by a Monarch who was according to the constitution meant to be merely a 'symbol', the Emperor was proposing leasing the islands to the United States while Japan retained nominal sovereignty (i.e. American bases in the Ryukyus in return for a demilitarized mainland). The Sebald note was first discovered by Shindo Eiichi in the US National Archives in 1979, a discovery that prompted Opposition parties to raise the issue in a bitter controversy in the Diet. See Shindo Eiichi, 'Bunkatsu Sareta Ryodo', in *Sekai*, April 1979, pp. 31-51. See also Takemae, 2000, Chapter 3.

lxxxix Bix, 1991, p. 331.

lxxxii This was conveyed in a 1 February 1946 memorandum prepared for MacArthur by his staff after he had been interviewed by members of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission, the Far Eastern Committee predecessor that was about to be disbanded. For text, see Takayanagi Kenzo, Otomo Ichiro and Tanaka Hideo, eds., *Nihonkoku Kempo Seitei no Katei*, Tokyo, Yuhikaku, 1972, Vol. 1, xxv, xxix-xxx, 90-98. See also Government Section, GHQ/SCAP, *Political Reorientation of Japan: September 1945 to September 1948*, Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949, Vol. 2, pp. 622-23.

lxxxiii Anti-Emperor sentiment was particularly strong in the United States, Australia and New Zealand. In a 29 June 1945 Gallup poll, 33% of all Americans surveyed wanted Hirohito's summary execution; only 3% supported his retention; and one fifth wanted his imprisonment or exile. On 18 September, there was a joint-resolution in Congress demanding the monarch's trial as a war criminal and, on 21 January 1946, the Australian representative to the UN War Crimes Commission advocated that Hirohito face war crimes' charges. Even two justices of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East – Chief Justice William Webb and Henri Bernard of France— were subsequently to register their belief that the trials were flawed by virtue of the decision not to call the Emperor to trial. For US opinion poll, see George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1935-71*, New York, Random House, 1972, Vol. 1, p. 512.

lxxxiv For text of Potsdam Declaration, see note 2 above.

lxxxv For discussion of this process, see in particular Dower, 1999, pp. 355-60; Koseki Shoichi, *The Birth of Japan's Postwar Constitution*, Westview Press, 1997, pp. 26-44; and Takemae Eiji, 2000, Chapter 7. In a poll taken in Osaka in 1948, over 25% of the respondents thought that Hirohito should abdicate as soon as possible; others speculated that popular support for abdication was in the region of at least 50%. See Yoshimi Yoshiaki, 'Senryoki Nihon no Minshu Ishiki – Senso Sekininron o Megutte', in *Shiso*, January 1992, pp. 91-93; Hata Ikuhiko, *Hirohito Tenno no Itsutsu no Ketsudan*, Tokyo, Kodansha, 1984, pp. 386-87; see also materials for June 1948 in papers of MacArthur aide, Laurence E. Bunker, in RG 5, box 77 ("OMS Correspondence"), MacArthur Memorial.

lxxxvi For inside accounts of the drafting process and negotiations with the Japanese, see Charles L. Kades, 'The American Role in Revising Japan's Imperial Constitution', in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 104, No. 2, 1989 and Beate Sirota Gordon, *The Only Woman in the Room: A Memoir*, Kodansha International, 1998. See also Susan Pharr, 'A Radical US Experiment: Women's Rights and the Occupation of Japan', in L.H. Redford, ed., *The Occupation of Japan: Impact of Legal Reform*, MacArthur Memorial, 1977.

lxxxvii In the words of conservative Yoshida Shigeru in Japan's House of Peers on 23 June 1946, the new constitution was drafted "to keep the imperial family in safety." Quoted in Bix, 1991, p. 325.

^{lxxxviii} Kinoshita, *Sokkin Nisshi*, p. 163-64 (English translation in Bix, 1991, p. 323). As Kinoshita also explains, MacArthur also felt his hand to be forced by an interview given by ex-premier Higashikuni, the emperor's uncle, to the *Yomiuri* newspaper in which he discussed for the first time in public the issue of the emperor's abdication.

^{lxxxix} For overview of the process of 'Japanizing' the Constitution, see, in particular, Dower, 1999, pp. 374-404; Koseki Shoichi, 'Japanizing the Constitution', *Japan Quarterly* 35.3 (July-September 1988); and Takemae Eiji, 2000, Chapter 6.

^{xc} Reference to the emperor being a spiritual source to his people in the summer 1946 report of the Japanese Lower House committee on the constitution, headed by Ashida Hitoshi (see Dower, *Empire and Aftermath*, 1979, p. 326). For Japanese efforts to qualify human rights to correspond with the law and public peace and order, see in particular, Koseki, *Shin Kempo no Tanjo*, (later translated as *The Birth of Japan's Postwar Constitution*), 1989, pp. 138-51; Justin Williams, *Japan's Political Revolution under MacArthur: A Participant's Account*, Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1979, pp. 115-16; Theodore H. McNelly's 1952 Columbia University Ph.D dissertation, 'Domestic and International Influences on Constitutional Revision in Japan, 1945-1946', pp. 171-94; Government Section, GHQ/SCAP, *The Political Reorientation of Japan: September 1945 to September 1948*, 1949, Vol. 2, pp. 625-36.

^{xcⁱ} On Japanese negotiators' efforts to withdraw rights from aliens through use of misleading terminology, see Koseki, 1988, pp. 234-40; Koseki, 1989, pp. 148, 160; and Koseki paper submitted in 1987 to American Historical Association entitled 'Japanese Constitutional Thought: The Process of Formulating the 1947 Constitution', pp. 11-13. See also Furukawa Atsushi, 'Gaikokujin no Jinken (1): Sengo Kempo Kaikaku to no Kanren ni Oite', in *Journal of Tokyo Keizai University*, No. 146, 1986, pp. 63-80; Mizuno Naoki, 'Zainichi Chosenjin-Taiwanjin Sansei-ken "Teishi" Jokyo no Seiritsu', in *Sekai Jinken Mondai Kenkyu Senta Kenkyu Kiyo*, No. 1, (15 March) 1996; and Thomas A. Bisson's manuscript unpublished in English entitled 'Reform Years in Japan, 1945-47: An Occupation Memoir' that has been translated into Japanese by Nakamura Masanori and Miura Yoichi, entitled, *Nihon Senryo Kaiso-ki*, Tokyo, Sanseido, 1983.

^{xcⁱⁱ} For citations of Yoshida's unequivocal interpretation of Article Nine meaning the renunciation of all types of war, including wars of self-defence, see Dower, 1979, pp. 382-83.

^{xcⁱⁱⁱ} Sansom's remark, which was made in 1957 to Allan Nevins as part of the Columbia University Oral History Project, is quoted at greater length in Ian Nish's January 1999 STICERD paper at the London School of Economics entitled 'George Bailey Sansom, Diplomat and Historian'. See also Roger Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy: Britain, the United States and Japan 1945-1952*, Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 68.

^{xc^{iv}} For an engrossing and sympathetic account of one-time conservative LDP stalwart, Mayor Motoshima Hitoshi, in particular, the way he used his trials and tribulations of ostracization from the 'powers that be' and threats and attempts on his

life by right-wing ultranationalist organizations to develop and publicize a broad-minded critique of the Emperor's failure to accept responsibility for the war and of Japan's lack of remorse and arrogance in its postwar dealings with its Asian neighbours, as well as the reluctance and fear of all but a very few politicians and officials (who did not even include the Mayor of Hiroshima) to speak out in support of him or his views, see Norma Field, *In the Realm of a Dying Emperor: A Portrait of Japan at Century's End*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1991, pp. 177-273.